UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/713,275	11/15/2000	Dan Kalish	2926/ASSIA/US	1579

26304   7590   02/25/2004

KATTEN MUCHIN ZAVIS ROSENMAN
575 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022-2585

EXAMINER
SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	3

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 November 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) *1,19,20* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 November 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-23 are presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2.   Claim 1 objected to because of the following informalities:

A. Improper step numbering 1st., 2nd. –12th.

B. Improper sub steps F (1), F (2), F (3) under the 6th step.

Applicant is required to remove them.

C. Improper step E and K.

3.   Claims 19 and 20 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in

improper form because a multiple dependent claim 19,20. See MPEP

§ 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 19, 20 are not been further treated on

the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and
distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   The term "Step E and K" in claim 1 is a relative term which renders the

claim indefinite. The term " Step E and K " is not defined by the claim, the

specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite

degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised

of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis

for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
> described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject
> matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a
> whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having
> ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Boor et al. (6,317,781) (hereinafter Boor) in view of

Saylor et al. (6,501,832) (hereinafter Saylor).

8.   As per claim 1, Boor discloses a method of navigating and orienting

through network hyper text language based pages ("network page") using

designated mobile device (fig 1) for displaying network page content and

enabling user interaction comprising the steps of (fig 1, element 136, col 4,

lines 1-9):

1 st. Aggregating any collection (col 4, lines 25-39) of network pages ("track

pages") (fig 7) and arranging them into sequences of network (col 16, lines

14-26): pages' URLs ("navigation track") (col 5, lines 12-14);

2nd. Placing navigation track (col 12, lines 29-40) at accessible location (col

8, line 50) on the network ("navigation track source") (col 4, lines 22-37)

3rd. Loading navigation track from navigation track source (col 12, lines 29-

40);

5th. Downloading track page (fig 19) data according to current track

location-code (fig 17b.2, col 31, lines 43-61);

6th. Editing current track page hyper text content: ("modified track page")

(col 13, lines 40-45)

F (1) Adding hypertext navigation items linking to navigation options (col 14,

lines 12 –23);

F (2) Exchanging URLs' references of embedded objects to absolute URL

references (col 13, lines 4-13 and col 28, lines 16-22);

F(3) Adding further hypertext language; content or command ("added

hypertext") (fig 17b.2, fig 18a.1-18a.3, col 31, lines 43-61)

7th. Sending the modified current track page content to the user display (col 31, lines 43-61 and col 32, lines 29-36);

8th. Presenting in mobile device screen respective information based on the current track page content (col 32, lines 29-63);

9th. Enabling user interaction (fig 17b.2, fig 18a.1-18a.3, col 31, lines 43-61), to select navigation option (col 32 line 28), based upon embedded navigation items (col 13, lines 9-14) to permit navigation (col 9, line 44) through navigation track (col 32, lines 29-63);

10th. Enabling user access to the added hypertext content or command (fig 17b.2, fig 18a.1-18a.3, col 15, lines 60-67);

11th. Upon selecting navigation option by the user (col 9, lines 45-58), identifying navigation target address (col 34, lines 36-45);

12th. Start the process above from step E where the current track is the navigation target address (col 34, lines 36-45) selected in K (col 16, lines 12-28);

Boor is silent about the Setting a code to denote current user location within

the navigation track ("track location-code") and location-code is the target

address.

However, Saylor discloses Setting a code (col 1, lines 57-61) to denote

current user location (col 17, lines 5-8) within the navigation track (col 14,

lines 51-54) ("track location-code") and location-code is the target address

(fig 2, col 10, lines 46-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the invention was made to combine Boor with Saylor

because it would provide extensions to the HTML language, the design of

multi-part forms, the use of limited number of keys to both navigate Web

Pages and select URLs, create menus of options for soft keys and

determining user location based on the assigned code at the server side.

9.   As per claim 2, Boor discloses prior to loading the navigation track,

updating navigation tack according to current circumstances e.g. time or

place (col 16, lines 12-27);

10.   As per claim 3, Boor discloses the step of enabling the user to edit the

navigation track e.g. delete any page (col 13, lines 41-45);

11.   As per claim 4, Boor discloses using a designated proxy server

("navigation server") (col 5, 16-19), further comprising the steps of:

- Further editing of page hypertext content by modifying URLs of

"hyperlinks" so as to point to the location of the navigation server (col 13,

lines 40-45);

- Upon selecting a hyperlink by the user (fig 20), downloading the requested

original page ("target page") by the navigation server (col 31,lines 28-42);

Editing the target page hyper-text content according; step F of the first

claim and the first step of claim 4 (col 7, lines 4-10); and

Transferring the modified track page to the mobile device (fig 17b.2, fig

18a.1-18a.3, col 31, lines 43-61);

12.   As per claim 5, Boor discloses the steps of Concurrently with

downloading of the current track page in step E, further downloading the

next-in-line pages along navigation track (col 31,lines 28-42); Editing each

downloaded track page according to the step F of claim 1 and first step of

claim 4 (col 7, lines 4-10);

Upon receiving request navigation target address of any track page (col 16,

lines 13-27), checking cache memory (col 18, lines 1-3) of navigation server

for said track page (col 13, lines 40-45);

Sending (col 9, line 17) the respective track page from the navigation server

to the user mobile device if the navigation target address matches any of the

track pages in the navigation server cache memory (col 18, lines 1-3);

13.   As per claim 6, Boor discloses prior to editing the downloaded track

pages, merging several track pages into one track page ("united track

page") (col 12, lines 34-37) wherein the size of the united track page is

limited according to the mobile device constrains 9col 28, lines 6-15);

Editing united track page according to the step F of claim 1 and first step of

claim 4;

- Sending the modified united track page to the user mobile device; and;

      -   Displaying the respective track page, placed at the united track page,

          upon user request for target address matching one of the track pages

          of the united track page (figure 13, lines 15-40);

      -

14.   As per claim 7, Boor is silent about the navigation item contains the

current track location code and a second code denoting a request for moving

to the next or previous track page along the navigation track;

However, Saylor discloses the navigation item contains the current track

location code and a second code denoting a request for moving to the next

or previous track page along the navigation track (col 18, lines 32-49). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention

was made to combine Boor with Saylor because it would provide extensions

to the HTML language, the design of multi-part forms, the use of limited

number of keys to both navigate Web Pages and select URLs, create menus

of options for soft keys and determining user location based on the assigned

code at the server side.

15.   As per claim 8, Boor is silent about the navigation item contains a code

denoting a request to re-load the navigation track from the navigation track

source and to update the location-code of the user agent to the first track;

However, Saylor discloses the navigation item contains a code denoting a

request to re-load the navigation track from the navigation track source and

to update the location-code of the user agent to the first track (col 18, lines

27-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

invention was made to combine Boor with Saylor because it would provide

extensions to the HTML language, the design of multi-part forms, the use of

limited number of keys to both navigate Web Pages and select URLs, create

menus of options for soft keys and determining user location based on the

assigned code at the server side.

16.   As per claim 9, Boor discloses the step of generating a network page

("track map page") containing list of links where each link points at one of

the track pages (fig 17b.2, fig 18a.1-18a.3, col 31, lines 43-61);

17.   As per claim 10, Boor discloses the step of displaying the track map

page at the user display (fig 17b.2, fig 18a.1-18a.3, col 31, lines 43-61).

Boor is silent about the navigation items contains a code denoting the

appropriate track page location.

However, Saylor discloses the navigation items contains a code denoting the

appropriate track page location track (col 18, lines 27-44). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to

combine Boor with Saylor because it would provide extensions to the HTML

language, the design of multi-part forms, the use of limited number of keys

to both navigate Web Pages and select URLs, create menus of options for

soft keys and determining user location based on the assigned code at the

server side.

18.   As per claim 11, Boor discloses modifying any network page ("modified

network page") containing hyperlinks pointing at track pages by editing said

hyperlinks so as to point to the location of the navigation server (col 4, lines

9-37);

19.   As per claim 12, Boor discloses the hypertext language in MMI format

(col 4, lines 65-67).

Boor fails to disclose the WML format;

However, Saylor discloses the WML format (col 14, line 57). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to

combine Boor with Saylor because it would provide extensions to the HTML

language, the design of multi-part forms, the use of limited number of keys

to both navigate Web Pages and select URLs, create menus of options for

soft keys and determining user location based on the assigned code at the

server side using XML, TML, WML, and MMI).

20.   As per claim 13, Boor discloses the mobile device is a cellular phone

device (col 1, line 20);

21.   As per claim 14, Boor discloses the aggregating operation is performed

by the user (col 6, lines 11-16);

22.   As per claim 15, Boor discloses the aggregating operation is performed

by professional editors further comprising the step of placing the navigation

track accessible to the users (col 6, lines 31-67);

23.   As per claim 16, Boor discloses the aggregation operation is processed

and based on any dynamically created computer-generated collection of

network pages ("dynamic page list") (col 30, lines 40-51).

24.   As per claim 17, Boor discloses presenting the user with the dynamic

page list (fig 19, col 30, lines 40-51); and

- Enabling the user to relocate directly to a location within the navigation

track using the dynamic page list (col 31, lines 25-41).

25.   As per claim 18, the aggregation operation further comprises the steps

of:

- Presenting the user with the dynamic page list (fig 19, col 30, lines 40-51);

- Enabling the user to select multiple network pages from the dynamic page

list (col 30, lines 40-51).

- Upon completion of the user-selection, updating the dynamic page list to

contain only said user-selected network pages (col 30, lines 60-67).

26.   As per claim 19, Boor discloses dynamic page list (col 30, lines 60-67)

is a search result list (col 31, lines 1-4);

27.   The methods 20, Boor discloses the dynamic page list is an inbox mail

list (col 46, lines 20 –21);

28.   As per claim 21, boor discloses each track page is a deck and the track

pages are merged together into the united track page in the form of a deck

containing cards collected from the different decks of the navigation track

(figure 20);

Boor fails to disclose the WML format;

However, Saylor discloses the WML format (col 14, line 57). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to

combine Boor with Saylor because it would provide extensions to the HTML

language, the design of multi-part forms, the use of limited number of keys

to both navigate Web Pages and select URLs, create menus of options for

soft keys and determining user location based on the assigned code at the

server side using XML, TML, WML, and MMI).

29.   As per claim 22, boor discloses the step of displaying track pages

locally in user agent from united deck upon user navigation requests to such

pages (figure 20);

30.   As per claim 23, boor discloses the step of collecting pages until size of

the united deck is optimized with respect to specific mobile device

capabilities (fig 20);

Boor fails to disclose the WML format;

However, Saylor discloses the WML format (col 14, line 57). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to

combine Boor with Saylor because it would provide extensions to the HTML

language, the design of multi-part forms, the use of limited number of keys

to both navigate Web Pages and select URLs, create menus of options for

soft keys and determining user location based on the assigned code at the

server side using XML, TML, WML, and MMI).

Conclusion

31.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered

pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U.S. Patent 6,360,252 to Rudy et al.

U.S. Patent 6,317,718 to Fano et al.

U.S. patent 6,657,647 to Bright et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications

from the examiner should be directed to Mohammad A Siddiqi whose

telephone number is (703) 305-0353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MAS

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100